



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------------------------------------|-------------|----------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|
| 10/600,056 | 06/20/2003 | Sudhindra P. Herle | SAMS01-00275 | 6021 |
| Docket Clerk P.O. Box 800889 Dallas, TX 75380 | | | EXAMINER YIGDALL, MICHAEL J | |
| | | | ART UNIT 2192 | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | MAIL DATE 09/08/2008 | DELIVERY MODE PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/600,056

Applicant(s)

HERLE ET AL.

Examiner

Michael J. Yigdall

Art Unit

2192

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 June 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5-12,15-22,25-27 and 30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,5-12,15-22,25-27 and 30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB08)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is responsive to Applicant's reply filed on June 16, 2008. Claims 1, 2, 5-12, 15-22, 25-27 and 30 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In the last Office action, the examiner noted that Imamatsu teaches a journal stored in non-volatile memory that includes status information. Here, Applicant contends that rather than a "journal comprising a plurality of entries," Imamatsu describes only a flag showing whether an installation is in progress or not in progress (remarks, pages 13-14).

However, the examiner respectfully submits that Applicant is mischaracterizing the teachings of the reference. The version management domain 42 (i.e., the "journal") of Imamatsu clearly comprises a "plurality of entries" (see FIG. 5). The sector-buffer-write completion flag to which Applicant refers (remarks, page 13) is merely one element of the version management domain 42. As noted in the last Office action, the status information stored in the version management domain 42 includes other parameters, such as a version-write completion flag and an update completion flag (see column 8, lines 24-32).

Applicant states that the claimed journal comprises both "first status information" and a "second parameter" that indicates a successful update, and concludes that Imamatsu does not teach or suggest a "plurality of entries" related to "status information associated with a re-programmed sector of non-volatile memory" (remarks, page 14).

As reasoned above, however, the journal of Imamatsu does comprise such a “plurality of entries.” Each entry in the version management domain 42 is related to status information associated with a re-programmed sector of non-volatile memory (see column 7, line 50 to column 8, line 32). Furthermore, Imamatsu does describe a “second parameter” that indicates a successful update. Specifically, the update completion flag “indicates whether the update of the section to be updated is completed” (column 8, lines 29-31).

Nonetheless, the examiner appreciates that as claimed, the recited “second parameter” indicates, more precisely, “that said first target code from said first target sector was successfully stored in said save-area of said non-volatile memory.” As set forth in the Office action, it is the Äijä reference that suggests the recited “save-area.” A person having ordinary skill in the art could, with predictable results, incorporate into the version management domain 42 of Imamatsu a “second parameter” indicating that first target code from a first target sector was successfully stored in a save-area of the non-volatile memory.

First, Äijä describes storing an indication in non-volatile memory “that the upgrade procedure is finished” (see column 5, lines 25-27). The upgrade procedure of Äijä comprises storing first target code from a first target sector in a save-area of non-volatile memory (see step S22 in FIG. 4) prior to storing a first block of replacement code into the first target sector (see step S26 in FIG. 4), such as recited in the claims. Second, the sector-buffer-write completion flag described in Imamatsu “indicates whether the update-used software for partial updating has been written into the sector buffer” (column 8, lines 27-29), and therefore is analogous to the recited “second parameter.”

The examiner respectfully reminds Applicant that the test for obviousness is not that the claimed invention must be expressly suggested in any one or all of the references. Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of the references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981). The combined teachings of Imamatsu and Äijä would have suggested the claimed subject matter to those of ordinary skill in the art.

Applicant contends that even if the examiner's interpretation of Äijä is correct, "there is no teaching or suggestion in Äijä to show that a check is preformed to see if the update was successfully preformed" (remarks, page 15).

However, the examiner respectfully points out that the claims do not positively recite performing any such checks. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). A reasonable interpretation is that in Äijä, the indication "that the upgrade procedure is finished" indicates that the upgrade procedure was successfully finished. Likewise, a reasonable interpretation of Imamatsu is that the version-write completion flag, sector-buffer-write completion flag and update completion flag indicate that each operation was successfully completed.

Applicant contends that the examiner "has not described in Imamatsu, Äijä, or the combination of Imamatsu and Äijä that a person of skill in the art would solve by adding the storage of such a plurality of entries to the combination of Imamatsu and Äijä," and further

contends that instead, “the motivation to store such a plurality of entries comes from the Applicants’ own specification” (remarks, page 15).

First, however, the version management domain 42 of Imamatsu already stores such a “plurality of entries” such as reasoned above. Second, the flags described in Imamatsu control the update decision process (see steps S13, S14 and S16 in FIG. 10). A “second parameter indicating that said first target code from said first target sector was successfully stored in said save-area of said non-volatile memory” would serve the same function. The examiner proposes that in terms of Imamatsu, such a parameter could be designated a “save-area-write completion flag.” Äijä provides a reason for storing a save-area-write completion flag in the version management domain 42 of Imamatsu, namely that such a parameter would enable the wireless communication device of Imamatsu to determine whether the operation was or was not interrupted before completion (see column 5, lines 2-4).

Moreover, the examiner respectfully points out that a rigid application of the “teaching, suggestion, or motivation” test is not necessary to support a conclusion of obviousness. See *KSR International Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 550 U.S. ___, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007).

Accordingly, the examiner respectfully submits that the record establishes a *prima facie* case of obviousness.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 2, 5-12, 15-22, 25-27 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,687,901 to Imamatsu (already of record, "Imamatsu") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,928,579 to Äijä (already of record, "Äijä").

With respect to claim 1 (previously presented), Imamatsu teaches a wireless communication device (see, for example, mobile terminal device 10 in FIG. 3) capable of downloading a software update file from a wireless network (see, for example, the abstract), said wireless communication device comprising:

a non-volatile memory capable of being re-programmed by sectors (see, for example, flash ROM 33 in FIG. 4A), wherein said non-volatile memory stores: (1) a target file to be updated (see, for example, control-software 43 in FIG. 4A), (2) said downloaded software update file (see, for example, download buffer 44 in FIG. 4A and column 6, lines 62-64), and (3) a journal comprising a plurality of entries, each of said plurality of entries containing status information associated with a re-programmed sector of said non-volatile memory (see, for example, version management domain 42 in FIG. 4A and FIG. 5, and see, for example, column 7, line 50 to column 8, line 32);

a random access memory (see, for example, RAM 34 in FIG. 4A); and

a main processor (see, for example, CPU 22 in FIG. 3) capable of replacing target code in said target file with replacement code from said downloaded software update file (see, for example, column 15, lines 34-56), wherein said main processor creates a first block of replacement code in said random access memory and re-programs a first target sector of said

non-volatile memory by storing said first block of replacement code into said first target sector (see, for example, column 12, lines 15-19, which shows creating a block of replacement code in RAM, and column 12, lines 21-23, which shows re-programming a target sector of the non-volatile memory with the block of replacement code), and wherein said main processor updates first status information in a first entry in said journal associated with said first target sector (see, for example, column 7, line 50 to column 8, line 32).

Imamatsu does not expressly disclose that said main processor is further capable of storing first target code from said first target sector in a save-area of said non-volatile memory prior to storing said first block of replacement code into said first target sector.

However, in an analogous art, Åijä teaches a crash recovery system comprising a wireless device that communicates with a server to download software updates (see, for example, the abstract), wherein the main processor is capable of storing first target code from a first target sector in a save-area of non-volatile memory (see, for example, step S22 in FIG. 4) prior to storing a first block of replacement code into the first target sector (see, for example, step S26 in FIG. 4), so as to revert back to the previous version in the event of a system crash (see, for example, column 5, lines 51-57).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teachings of Åijä into Imamatsu and store the existing code (i.e., first target code) into a save-area of the non-volatile memory before storing the new code (i.e., replacement code) in the first target sector.

Imamatsu in view of Åijä further teaches or suggests that said first status information comprises a second parameter indicating that said first target code from said first target sector

was successfully stored in said save-area of said non-volatile memory (see, for example, Äijä, column 5, lines 25-27, which shows storing such a parameter, and column 5, lines 2-4, which shows that the parameter enables the device to determine whether the operation was interrupted before completion, and see, for example, Imamatsu, column 8, lines 24-32, which shows that the status information includes several such parameters).

With respect to claim 2 (original), the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated, and Imamatsu in view of Äijä further teaches or suggests that said first status information comprises a first parameter indicating that said first block of replacement code was successfully stored in said first target sector (see, for example, Imamatsu, column 8, lines 24-32, which shows an update completion flag).

With respect to claim 5 (previously presented), the rejection of claim 2 is incorporated, and Imamatsu in view of Äijä further teaches or suggests that said main processor is further capable of storing said first target code from said save-area back into said first target sector after a power loss in said mobile station (see, for example, Äijä, column 2, lines 49-60, and column 5, line 50 to column 6, line 5).

With respect to claim 6 (original), the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated, and Imamatsu in view of Äijä further teaches or suggests that said first block of replacement code in said random access memory is equivalent in size to a sector of said non-volatile memory (see, for example, Imamatsu, column 6, lines 15-22, and column 8, line 65 to column 9, line 1).

With respect to claim 7 (original), the rejection of claim 6 is incorporated, and Imamatsu in view of Äijä further teaches or suggests that said main processor, after said wireless communication device is restarted after a power loss, uses status information stored in said journal to identify a last successfully re-programmed sector in said non-volatile memory (see, for example, Imamatsu, column 7, lines 32-40, and column 15, lines 34-56).

With respect to claim 8 (original), the rejection of claim 7 is incorporated, and Imamatsu in view of Äijä further teaches or suggests that said main processor resumes replacing target code in said target file with replacement code from said downloaded software update file by re-programming a next sequential sector in said non-volatile memory following said last successfully re-programmed sector (see, for example, Imamatsu, column 7, lines 50-60).

With respect to claim 9 (original), the rejection of claim 8 is incorporated, and Imamatsu in view of Äijä further teaches or suggests that said journal is stored in at least a first journal sector and a second journal sector of said non-volatile memory (see, for example, Imamatsu, FIG. 5).

With respect to claim 10 (original), the rejection of claim 9 is incorporated, and Imamatsu in view of Äijä further teaches or suggests that said main processor, in response to a determination that said first journal sector is full of journal entries, erases said second journal sector and stores a next journal entry in said second journal sector (see, for example, Imamatsu, column 7, lines 50-60).

With respect to claims 11, 12, 15-22, 25-27 and 30, the claims recite limitations that are analogous to those recited in claims 1, 2 and 5-10, and are therefore rejected for the same reasons as noted above (see the rejection of claims 1, 2, 5-10).

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael J. Yigdall whose telephone number is 571-272-3707. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday from 8:00 AM to 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on 571-272-3695. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Michael J. Yigdall
Examiner
Art Unit 2192

/Michael J. Yigdall/
Examiner, Art Unit 2192